



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same basis of immigration as all other peoples. There has never been any real ground for treating them differently from other races. The hue and cry of being overrun by the vast hordes of them, and similar and exactly contrary pleas, for example, that they will not stay and become a part of us, have all been time and again shown to be essentially groundless and some of them extremely ridiculous. The real cause of our extraordinary conduct toward them has been race prejudice and race hatred and contempt. It will be a curious comment upon our national intelligence and character if the boycott against our goods and products succeeds in driving into us the simple lesson of justice and friendly conduct towards a foreign people which reason and the great principles of our national life have so far failed to teach us. It will be a new illustration of the almightiness of the dollar.

We have been boasting a good deal recently of how good and great we have shown ourselves toward China in the crisis brought on by the Russo-Japanese war. We now are given an opportunity to show to the world, by repealing the scandalous Chinese exclusion law, which we shall anyway probably never be able to get renewed under the sanctimonious cover of a treaty, that we have the real spirit of goodness and greatness in us. Let us for once "dare to be great." It will be worth infinitely more to us than any amount of talking.

The Japanese House Tax Case.

The arbitrators chosen from the Hague Court to settle the so-called Japanese House Tax Case between Japan on the one side and Great Britain, France and Germany on the other, rendered their decision on the 22d of May last. So little attention, however, was given to the subject by the Associated Press that very few people, in this country at any rate, know that the award has been given.

This was actually the second controversy to be carried to the Hague Court, the protocols of submission having been signed as long ago as the 28th of August, 1902. The case was therefore under consideration for nearly three years. The dispute arose over the attempt of the Japanese officials to tax improvements on lands held by foreigners under perpetual lease. In the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of April 4, 1896, between Japan and Germany, in that of August 4, 1896, between Japan and France, and in that of July 16, 1894, between Japan and Great Britain, it had been stipulated that when certain "foreign quarters shall have been incorporated in the respective communes of Japan, existing leases in perpetuity under which property is now held in the said settlements shall be confirmed, and no conditions whatsoever other than those contained in such existing leases shall be imposed in respect of such property."

The Japanese government contended that this stipulation referred only to the land, not to buildings erected thereon; the three European governments held, on the contrary, that all improvements on the lands were exempt, under the terms of the treaties, from taxation. The question actually submitted to the Hague Court was therefore that of the proper interpretation of the language of this section of the treaties.

For the constitution of the tribunal to determine the controversy, Japan named from the Hague Court Mr. Itchiro Motono, her Minister to France, and the three European governments selected (by lot) Professor Louis Renault, of the Law Faculty of Paris. These two chose Mr. Gregers Gram, former State Minister of Norway, as umpire.

The decision of the tribunal was against the contention of Japan, and was as follows:

"The provisions of the treaties and other engagements mentioned in the arbitration protocols exempt not only the lands held in virtue of the perpetual leases granted by the Japanese government or in its name, but they exempt the lands and the buildings of every kind built or which may hereafter be built upon these lands, from all imports, taxes, burdens, contributions or conditions of whatever kind other than those expressly stipulated in the treaties in question."

The decision was rendered by a majority of the tribunal, Mr. Gram, the umpire, and Professor Renault representing the three European powers. Mr. Motono, following the privilege granted him by Article 52 of the Hague Convention, recorded his "absolute disagreement with the majority of the tribunal."

This case cannot be considered, we suppose, one of the greatest importance, but its settlement by the Hague Court strengthens the prestige of the great tribunal. The decision, so far as it has a bearing upon the general question of the taxation of improvements upon lands leased in perpetuity from governments, will go far towards establishing as a principle in international law the position taken by the arbitrators. But the chief significance of the case as a whole is that it brought Great Britain, Germany and France together as friends before a tribunal where questions are not determined by the brute might of great armies and big navies, but by the demands of reason and justice. Friendship in small ways naturally leads to friendship in larger ways, and France and Germany will prove to be no exception to the rule.

On account of the editor's absence in Europe attending the Lucerne Peace Congress and other meetings, there will be no issue of the Advocate of Peace in September. The October number will contain full accounts of the European meetings.